

1 Molecular changes in two maize (*Zea mays* L.) synthetics after reciprocal selection with  
2 two alternative methods

3 Ordas B<sup>a</sup>, Malvar RA<sup>a</sup>, Díaz R<sup>a</sup>, Butron A<sup>a</sup>

4

5 <sup>a</sup> Misión Biológica de Galicia, CSIC, P.O. box 28, 36080 Pontevedra, Spain.

6

7

8

9 Communicating author: Ordas B, [bordas@mbg.csic.es](mailto:bordas@mbg.csic.es), telephone: +34986854800, fax:  
10 +34986841362

11

12

13

14 Agronomic evaluations demonstrated that a modification of the classical full-sib  
15 reciprocal recurrent selection (RRS-FS) which, in addition to crosses, uses  $S_2$  families  
16 evaluation (RRS-FS- $S_2$ ) is more efficient than the classical method for developing high  
17 yielding crosses between two varieties. The objective of this study was to investigate the  
18 changes in genetic diversity and structure after performing RRS-FS and RRS-FS- $S_2$   
19 selections. RRS-FS- $S_2$  reduced more the variability, produced more differentiation  
20 between cycles of selection derived from the same materials but less between reciprocal  
21 populations, and produced a more clear change in the contribution of the parental lines  
22 than RRS-FS. On the other hand, the type of selection method did not have a  
23 considerable effect on the structure of the populations measured as departure of Hardy-  
24 Weinberg (HW) equilibrium at single markers and on linkage disequilibrium (LD)  
25 between pairs of markers. We identified some individual markers which were not in  
26 HW equilibrium in several populations probably due to genes favouring assortative  
27 mating. We also found pairs of markers which increased their LD with selection  
28 probably due to epistasis.

29

30

31 Keywords: Hardy-Weinberg equilibrium; linkage disequilibrium; recurrent selection,  
32 molecular markers; population genetics; genetic variability

33

34

## 35 Introduction

36

37 Interpopulation selection methods are of interest for crops as maize (*Zea mays* L.)  
38 because the commercial varieties are mainly hybrids. Reciprocal recurrent selection  
39 (RRS) was proposed to improve the performance of two populations, as well as the  
40 cross between them (Comstock et al. 1949). Classical full-sib RRS (RRS-FS) uses  
41 interpopulation full-sib progenies (Hallauer and Eberhart 1970). A modification of the  
42 RRS-FS procedure was proposed (Moreno-González and Hallauer 1982) which  
43 evaluates S<sub>2</sub> families in addition to full-sib progenies (RRS-FS-S<sub>2</sub>). Two parallel RRS  
44 programs (RRS-FS and RRS-FS-S<sub>2</sub>) were carried out from the same original  
45 populations of maize to assess the relative efficiency of each method (Ordas et al.  
46 2012). The evaluation of those RRS programs allowed to conclude that for developing  
47 high yielding and stable crosses between two varieties RRS-FS-S<sub>2</sub> is more efficient than  
48 RRS-FS.

49 In recurrent selection, there is a tradeoff between the intensity of selection and the  
50 effective population size given that the total number of families evaluated is fixed as  
51 determined by resources. This, in turn, implies a tradeoff between short term selection,  
52 favoured by higher intensities and long term selection favoured by higher effective  
53 population sizes which maintain higher levels of variability for longer. The estimation  
54 of the change of the genetic variation and structure of populations under selection  
55 allows an assessment of the expected progress of selection in the long term. The genetic  
56 variability and structure of populations can be efficiently estimated with molecular  
57 markers and the information obtained can be used to choose the selection methodology

58 more appropriate to our breeding objectives. By means of molecular markers, it was  
59 found some reduction in genetic variability during the cycles of intrapopulation or  
60 interpopulation recurrent selection programs for the number of families usually selected  
61 (10-20 selected out of 100-200 evaluated) in those programs; the magnitude of the lost  
62 of variability depended of the germplasm and the particular program (Labate et al. 1997;  
63 Pinto et al. 2003; Butron et al. 2005; Romay et al. 2012; Peña-Asin et al. 2013). In  
64 addition to a lost of variability, during RRS-FS selection, a change on the structure of  
65 the populations, affecting the linkage disequilibrium (LD) and the genetic distance  
66 between reciprocal population, was observed (Labate et al. 1997; Romay et al. 2012;  
67 Peña-Asin et al. 2013). However, there is not information about the effect of RRS-FS-S<sub>2</sub>  
68 on the molecular genetic variation and structure of the selected populations. Therefore,  
69 the objective of this study is to investigate the changes in molecular variation and  
70 population structure (Hardy-Weinberg (HW), LD and relative contribution of the  
71 parental lines to the synthetics) following RR-FS and RR-FS-S<sub>2</sub> selection, comparing  
72 the changes resulting from both methods

73

## 74 Material and methods

75

### 76 Plant material and simple sequence repeat (SSR) genotyping

77 The populations analyzed in this study were derived from two parallel programs of RRS  
78 starting from EPS20 (a Reid synthetic) and EPS21 (a no Reid synthetic)  
79 (Supplementary Table 1). Two cycles of RRS-FS and RRS-FS-S<sub>2</sub> (Supplementary Fig  
80 1) were carried out as described in Ordas et al. (2012), resulting in 10 populations (the 2  
81 original populations and 8 derived populations-2 synthetics × 2 cycles × 2 methods-).  
82 Forty-eight individuals were sampled from each population for DNA extraction. The  
83 DNA was extracted following the methodology of Liu and Whittier (1994). Fifty two  
84 SSRs distributed throughout the genome were examined. The SSRs were selected  
85 because in previous studies performed adequately in multiple populations (Butron et al.  
86 2005; Romay et al. 2012). The SSR products were separated by capillary  
87 electrophoresis using 1x Tris base, boric acid (5.5 g l<sup>-1</sup>) and ethylenediaminetetraacetic  
88 acid (EDTA) (2 mM) on a polymerase TAQ (30,000 ud). A Beckman Coulter CEQ  
89 8800 Genetic analysis system (Beckman Coulter Inc.) was used for fragment separation  
90 and identification.

91

### 92 Statistical analysis

93 The following genetic variability parameters were calculated for all populations:  
94 percentage of polymorphic loci, number of alleles per locus, observed heterozygosity  
95 and fixation index. To study the change in relationships between populations during  
96 selection, genetic distance between populations was calculated using Nei's distance (Nei

1978). Hardy-Weinberg equilibrium at individual markers and the linkage disequilibrium for pair of markers were tested with an exact test based on the multinomial distribution which determines the probabilities of all possible samples of the same size as the observed sample assuming the hypothesis is true (Weir 1996). All analyses were performed with Genetic Data Analysis (Lewis and Zaykin 2001).

## Results

### Genetic diversity and genetic distances between populations

For EPS20 and EPS21, the variability measured as percentage of polymorphic loci, number of alleles per locus and observed heterozygosity was generally higher in the original population than in selected cycles of RRS-FS and RRS-FS-S<sub>2</sub> (Table 1). The values were lower in the cycles of RRS-FS-S<sub>2</sub> than in the cycles of RRS-FS for most of the variability parameters estimated, particularly for the cycles derived from EPS21. The genetic distance between reciprocal populations increased with both types of RRS (Table 2), being slightly higher for RRS-FS than for RRS-FS-S<sub>2</sub>. The genetic distance between the original populations, EPS20 and EPS21, and their improved cycles of selection increased with RRS-FS and RRS-FS-S<sub>2</sub>. The increment was higher for materials derived from EPS21 than for EPS20 and for RRS-FS-S<sub>2</sub> than for RRS-FS.

The distance between the synthetic parental lines and the original composites varied from 0.22 to 0.48 between lines in EPS20, but it was close to 0.5 for most lines in EPS21 (Table 3). RRS-FS maintained the genetic contribution of most parental lines observed in the original cycles, while RRS-FS-S<sub>2</sub> changed the genetic contributions of the lines in both populations.

Hardy-Weinberg (HW) and linkage disequilibrium (LD)

The fixation index ( $f$ ), that is, the excess of homozygosity, averaged over all loci and populations was 0.02. The sign of the fixation index, averaged over loci, was positive for eight of the populations, while its magnitude varied between -0.04 and 0.08 between populations (Table 1). The number of loci not in HW equilibrium varied between 10 and 15 (about 20-30 % of the markers) in most populations. The cycle 2 of selection tended to have few loci in HW disequilibrium and less proportion of polymorphic loci. The number of markers in disequilibrium was similar for the two types of RRS (data not shown). Sixteen markers, located in all chromosomes except chromosome 8, were not in HW equilibrium in three or more of the populations (Table 4). Eleven of those markers had an excess of homozygosity in most populations, while fourteen of them had a positive fixation index, averaged over populations. The markers bnlg1347 (bin 1.10), phi114 (7.03), and umc1453 (10.04) had the highest distortion toward homozygosity excess (fixation index close to 0.30) and the marker umc1505 (9.05) toward heterozygosity excess (fixation index close to -0.30).

141 40 % and 21 % pairs of markers were in linkage disequilibrium (LD), tested at 5 % of  
 142 significance, in EPS20 and EPS21, respectively. The number of pairs in LD decreased  
 143 with both selections (RRS-FS and RRS-FS –S<sub>2</sub>) in EPS20, but increased in EPS21  
 144 (Table 5).. For some chromosomes the number of pairs of markers with LD changed  
 145 without any appreciable tendency across the cycles of selection (Table 5). However, for  
 146 chromosome 9, the number of pairs of markers in LD was consistently low in most  
 147 populations. LD in chromosome 1 was high in EPS20 and populations derived from it  
 148 (about 50% of the pairs in LD), but low in the EPS21 and related populations (about 10-  
 149 20%). LD at chromosome 4 was also high (60%) in EPS20, and was reduced with  
 150 selection, while LD was low in EPS21 (0%) and increased in the cycles of selection  
 151 derived from it. LD at chromosome 2 was high (50%) across EPS21 cycles, but low  
 152 (20%) in EPS20 (although LD was higher in the cycles of selection, particularly C2). At  
 153 chromosome level, the number of pairs in LD in the selection cycles of RRS-FS was  
 154 similar to the number of pairs in RRS-FS-S<sub>2</sub>. For example, both RRS-FS and RRS-FS-S<sub>2</sub>  
 155 maintained a high level of LD at chromosome 1 in EPS20 and a low level in EPS21. At  
 156 local level, we observed that some markers were involved in higher or lower number of  
 157 pairs with significant LD than other markers, for example, phi056 (1.01) in EPS20-  
 158 RRS-FS-S<sub>2</sub> and umc1466 (4.08) in EPS21-RRS-FS-S<sub>2</sub> (Table 6). Also, about 25 %, 90  
 159 % and 100 % of pairs in which phi109275 (1.03) and phi114 (7.03) were involved had a  
 160 significant LD in EPS20C0, EPS20FSC1 and EPS20FSC2 (data not shown), but the  
 161 total percentage of pairs in LD, considering all markers, in these populations were 40 %,  
 162 37 % and 20 %. For these markers and also for markers umc1165 (2.01), umc1453  
 163 (10.04) and umc1930 (10.04), the number of pairs in LD tended to be higher in the  
 164 selected cycles than in the original populations (data not shown). The marker umc1466  
 165 had in EPS20 similar change in allele frequencies in both selection programs, but



different change in LD, while umc1963 had in EPS21 similar change in LD in both programs, but different change in allele frequencies (Table 6).

## Discussion

### Genetic diversity and genetic distances between populations

The variability of the original populations was in the range of magnitude of original population of other RRS programs (Labate et al. 1997; Pinto et al. 2003; Romay et al. 2012; Peña-Asin et al. 2013). According to different parameters (percentage of polymorphic loci, number of alleles per locus and observed heterozygosity), EPS21 has higher variability than EPS20. This was expected as several parental inbreds of EPS20 are related and derived from B14 or WF9, while the origin of the parental inbreds of EPS21 is more diverse: open pollinated varieties from Northwestern Spain, Italy France, etc (Butrón et al. 2003, 2009). Ordas et al. (2012) already found that EPS21 had higher additive variance than EPS20 in the evaluation of several S<sub>2</sub> families derived from both populations. The decrease in variability per cycle of selection found in our selection program was in similar range (0-2%, 2-8%, and 2-6%, for percentage of polymorphic loci, number of alleles per locus and observed heterozygosity, respectively) to other intra and inter population selection programs (Butron et al. 2005; Romay et al. 2012; Peña-Asin et al. 2013). This decrease could be due to the effect of selection increasing and decreasing the frequency of favourable and unfavourable alleles, respectively, and the frequency of neutral alleles linked to them. The frequency changes could be also due

to the effect of genetic drift which is originated for the reduced number of families selected each generation. Otherwise, the reduced number of families is mandatory if a high intensity of selection has to be maintained with an approachable number of families under evaluation. Regarding the comparison between the two methods of selection, the decrease in variability was more evident in RRS-FS-S<sub>2</sub> which is also more efficient for improving grain yield, according to theoretical predictions and empirical data (Moreno-González and Hallauer 1982; Ordas et al. 2012). The higher efficiency of RRS-FS-S<sub>2</sub> compared to RRS-FS implies a higher fixing rate of favourable alleles and neutral alleles linked to them which could account for a reduction in variability. The RRS-FS-S<sub>2</sub> was effective by increasing the yield of EPS20 and EPS20 × EPS21, but not the yield of EPS21 although this population presented a high variability (Ordas et al. 2012). In RRS-FS-S<sub>2</sub>, EPS21 had higher loss of variability than EPS20, according to our molecular data, which could be indicative of higher genetic drift and inbreeding depression. The inbreeding depression can counterbalance the favourable effect of selection. Peña-Asin et al. (2013) also found that one of the two reciprocal populations did not response to RRS; that population had higher loss of variability (according to molecular markers) and higher inbreeding depression (estimated from crosses to the original population).

In agreement with the increase of heterosis found in the phenotypic evaluation of the RRS program (Ordas et al. 2012), the genetic distance between the original populations increased with RRS. This result was also found in other RRS (Hinze et al. 2005; Romay et al. 2012). The increment of genetic distance between reciprocal populations was slightly higher in RRS-FS than in RRS-FS-S<sub>2</sub> which also is in concordance with a higher increment in heterosis found in RRS-FS (Ordas et al. 2012). The criteria of

214 selection in RRS-FS was exclusively based on the performance of the crosses between  
215 families from the two reciprocal populations which could favour more the heterosis than  
216 the criteria of selection in RRS-FS-S<sub>2</sub> which also included information of the S<sub>2</sub> families  
217 (Moreno-González and Hallauer 1982). On the other hand, the distance between the  
218 original and the improved populations was higher with RRS-FS-S<sub>2</sub> probably due to a  
219 more efficient increment of favourable alleles with additive effects.

220

221 The genetic distances of the synthetic parental lines to the original and selected  
222 populations were estimated to quantify the contribution of each line to the populations  
223 and to measure the effect of both types of selection on the relative contribution of the  
224 lines. EPS20 was developed with 5 lines derived from B14 and 3 lines derived from  
225 WF9. The distance between the lines and the original synthetic reflects this structure.  
226 The lines derived from B14, particularly those with higher proportion of this line, were  
227 more close to the synthetic (distance=0.2-0.3) than the lines derived from WF9  
228 (distance=0.4-0.5) (Butron et al. 2003; 2009). On the contrary, EPS21 was developed  
229 from lines from different origin and the distance between them and the original  
230 synthetic was similar for most of the lines (distance=0.5, approximately). In agreement  
231 with Labate et al. (1997), RRS-FS maintained the contribution observed in the original  
232 cycles for most of the lines, except EP17 in EPS21. The loss of contribution of this line  
233 was also observed in RRS-FS-S<sub>2</sub>, but at a lower level. It is possible that EP17 had lower  
234 amount of favourable alleles or complementary alleles to EPS20 than other lines of  
235 EPS21. Contrary to RRS-FS, RRS-FS-S<sub>2</sub> changed the genetic contributions of the lines  
236 in both populations. In EPS20, RRS-FS-S<sub>2</sub> increased the distance between the synthetic  
237 and several of the B14 derived lines making that most lines had similar distances with  
238 the synthetic (about 0.4-0.5). Therefore, selection could have favoured the WF9 derived

239 lines at the expense of the B14 derived lines, probably due to the best adaptation of  
240 WF9 derived lines to Atlantic conditions. In EPS21, RRS-FS-S<sub>2</sub> increased the distance  
241 between the lines and the synthetic, particularly with the lines EP53, PB130 and F473.  
242 Given that the increments that showed the population cross with RRS-FS-S<sub>2</sub> were  
243 similar to the increments shown by EPS20 (Ordas et al. 2012) the authors suggested that  
244 RRS-FS-S<sub>2</sub>, at difference of RRS-FS, was able to manipulate the additive effects,  
245 particularly those present in EPS20. The molecular data were consistent with this  
246 hypothesis, and suggest, besides, that those favourable additive effects could come from  
247 the WF9 lines.

248

249 Hardy-Weinberg and linkage disequilibrium

250

251 The percentage of loci not in Hardy-Weinberg equilibrium in our populations was  
252 similar to those found in other selection experiments (Kahler et al. 1986; Labate et al.  
253 2000). In agreement with several selection experiments (Kahler et al. 1986; Labate et al.  
254 2000; Butron et al. 2005; Hinze et al. 2005; Romay et al. 2012) we observed an excess  
255 of homozygosity. Some hypotheses have been proposed to explain the excess of  
256 homozygous, including reduced sampling size, positive assortative mating and  
257 genotyping errors. However, the magnitude of the fixation index in our selection  
258 program seems to be too small to have important implications. In general, we conclude  
259 that the sampling size or the assortative mating did not greatly affect the structure of the  
260 populations, at least, when the equilibrium is estimated at individual loci. Although the  
261 excess of homozygous was not important when the total effect was measured as the  
262 average value of all markers, it could be relevant in specific regions of the genome. This

is especially evident for three markers (bnlg1347, phi114, and umc1453) which had a positive fixation index in 9 of the populations, a significant departure from Hardy-Weinberg in 5 or 6 populations, and a large value of the parameter ( $f=0.3$ ). We expected that distortions due to sampling size would not be restricted to local regions, but spread along the genome. In distortions due to sampling size, we did not expect either a high consistency across populations as we found in some of the markers. The most likely cause of consistent distortion in some of the markers is the positive assortative mating due to differences in flowering time between the families. The marker bnlg1347 had a significant departure of Hardy-Weinberg equilibrium toward homozygosity not only in 5 of our populations, but also in one of the populations analyzed by Butron et al. (2005) and Romay et al. (2012). However, the most consistent departure from Hardy-Weinberg equilibrium occurred in umc1453 (10.04): in 6 out of 10 populations in our experiment ( $f=0.3$ ), in 3 out of 3 in Butron et al. (2005) ( $f=0.3$ ), and 4 out of 6 in Romay et al. (2012) ( $f=0.2$ ). This marker is located in chromosome 10 at the bin position 10.04 where one of main QTLs for flowering time has been found; the importance of this QTL is due not only to its large effect, but also due to its consistency in different genetic backgrounds (Ducrocq et al. 2009 and references therein). The coincidence of a large QTL for flowering time and a significant excess of homozygous in the same region supports the hypothesis of genetic distortion due to positive assortative mating (Butron et al. 2005).

The high level of LD in the original synthetics was probably generated during the development of the synthetics due to the cross of inbred lines of different origin. The effect of RRS selection on the number of pairs of markers in LD was different in EPS20 (about 10 % less LD in C2) and EPS21 (about 5 % more LD in C2). Similar results were obtained in other RRS programs in which one population increased and the other

288 decreased the pairs of markers in LD (Labate et al. 2000; Romay et al. 2012; Peña-Asin  
289 et al. 2013). The both types of reciprocal selections have similar effects on the total  
290 number of pairs in LD and on the number of markers not in HW equilibrium, suggesting  
291 that the type of recurrent selection seems not to have a large effect in the structure of the  
292 populations. We found some heterogeneity between chromosomes in the number of  
293 pairs of markers in LD, for example, the chromosome 9 had a lower number of pairs in  
294 LD than other chromosomes across different populations. This was probably due to  
295 variation in chromosome specific recombination rates which was reported in maize by  
296 Bauer et al. (2013). We expected in regions with higher recombination rates lower LD.  
297 Bauer et al. (2013) found that the chromosome 9 had the highest recombination rate  
298 which is in concordance with our results. We found some differences in LD between  
299 EPS20 (a dent synthetic) and EPS21 (a flint synthetic), particularly for chromosomes 1,  
300 2 and 4, which is also in concordance with results of Bauer et al. (2013) who found  
301 heterogeneity in the recombination profiles of Dent and Flint populations for some  
302 chromosomes, including chromosomes 2 and 4. We found some heterogeneity in LD  
303 not only at chromosome level but also at local level as some markers were involved in  
304 higher or lower number of pairs with significant LD than other markers. Thus, although  
305 the total percentage of pairs (counting all markers) with LD decreased with selection in  
306 EPS20, some particular markers had higher number of LD in the selected cycles of  
307 EPS20 than in the original population. The most evident increment in LD was observed  
308 for phi114 and phi109275 in RRS-FS which changed from a lower number of pairs in  
309 LD than the average (20-30% vs. 40%) in EPS20 to a higher number than the average  
310 (90-100% vs. 20-37%) in the selected cycles. Epistasis acting at local level could have  
311 generated this increment in LD in some markers of EPS20 and also could play a role in  
312 the increment of LD found in EPS21 across the genome. Epistasis has been proposed as

a possible explanation for the increasing of LD found in other RRS programs (Romay et al. 2012; Peña-Asin et al. 2013). LD can be also generated by random drift in small populations, but only between loosely linked loci (Labate et al. 2000) which is not the case in our experiment. In some markers, a similar change in allele frequency did not imply a similar change in LD, and vice versa, a similar change in LD did not imply a similar change in allele frequency which could be indicative that the change in allele frequency did not greatly affect the LD.

The RRS-FS-S<sub>2</sub> method produces higher improvement of the population cross and of one of the populations per se than the RRS-FS method. The molecular data reported here gives complementary information about the characteristics of each method. In our experiment, RRS-FS-S<sub>2</sub> reduced more the variability, produced more differentiation among populations derived from the same materials but less differentiation between reciprocal populations, and produced a more clear change in the contribution of the parental lines than RRS-FS. These data are consistent with the hypothesis that RRS-FS-S<sub>2</sub> is more efficient than RRS-FS because is able to manipulate the additive effects (Ordas et al. 2012). On the other hand, the type of selection method did not have a considerable effect in the structure of the populations measured as departure of HW equilibrium at single markers or LD between pairs of markers. The generalization of our conclusions has to be made with caution as our results are based on one selection process without replication. We identified some individual markers which were not in HW equilibrium in several of the populations probably due to genes favouring assortative mating. We also found pairs of markers which increased their LD with selection probably due to epistasis.

337 Acknowledgments

338 Research was supported by the Spanish Plan of Research and Development (AGL2012-  
339 33415). Bernardo Ordas acknowledges a Ramon y Cajal contract from the Ministry of  
340 Economy and Competitiveness

341



342 Bauer E, Falque M, Walter H et al. (2013) Intraspecific variation of recombination rate  
 343 in maize. *Gen Biol* 14:R103

344 Butron A, Tarrío R, Revilla P, Ordás A, Malvar RA (2005) Molecular changes in the  
 345 maize composite EPS12 during selection for resistance to pink stem borer. *Theor*  
 346 *Appl Genet* 110:044-1051

347 Butron A, Revilla P, Romay MC, Ordas A, Malvar RA (2009) Causes of agronomic  
 348 differences between synthetics developed by the random and convergent cross  
 349 methods. *Fiel Crop Res* 110:229-234

350 Comstock RE, Robinson HF, Harvey PH (1949) A breeding procedure designed to  
 351 make maximum use of both general and specific combining ability. *Agron J*  
 352 41:360-367

353 Ducrocq S, Giauffret C, Madur D, Combes Valerie, Dumas F, Jouanne S, Coubriche D,  
 354 Jamin P, Moreau L, Charcosset A (2009) Fine mapping and haplotype structure  
 355 analysis of a major flowering time quantitative trait locus on maize chromosome  
 356 10. *Genetics* 183:1555-1563

357 Hallauer AR, Eberhart SA (1970) Reciprocal full-sib selection. *Crop Sci* 10:315-316

358 Hinze LL, Kresovich S, Nason JD, Lamkey KR (2005) Population genetic diversity in a  
 359 maize reciprocal recurrent selection program. *Crop Sci* 45:2435-2442

360 Kahler AI, Hallauer AR, Gardner CO (1986) Allozyme polymorphisms within and  
 361 among open-pollinated and adapted exotic populations of maize. *Theor Appl Genet*  
 362 72:592-601

363 Labate JA, Lamkey KR, Lee M, Woodman WL (1997) Molecular genetic diversity after  
 364 reciprocal recurrent selection in BSSS and BSCB1 maize populations. *Crop Sci*  
 365 37:416-423

366 Labate JA, Lamkey KR, Lee M, Woodman WL (2000) Hardy-Weinberg and linkage  
 367 equilibrium estimates in the BSSS and BSCB1 random mated populations. *Maydica*  
 368 45:243-255

369 Lewis PO, Zaykin D (2001) Genetic Data Analysis: Computer program for the analysis  
 370 of allelic data. Versión 1.0 (d16c).  
 371 <http://lewis.eeb.uconn.edu/lewishome/software.html>

372 Liu YG, Whittier RF (1994) Preparation of megabase plant DNA from nuclei in agarose  
 373 plugs and microbeads. *Nucleic Acids Research* 22:2168-2169

374 Moreno-Gonzalez J, Hallauer AR (1982) Combined S<sub>2</sub> and crossbred family selection in  
 375 full-sib reciprocal recurrent selection. *Theor Appl Genet* 61:353-358

376 Nei M (1978) Estimation of average heterozigosity and genetic distance from a small  
 377 number of individuals. *Genetics* 89:583-590

378 Ordas B, Butron A, Alvarez A, Revilla P, Malvar RA (2012) Comparison of two  
 379 methods of reciprocal selection in maize (*Zea mays* L.). *Theor Appl Genet*  
 380 124:1183-1191

381 Peña-Asin J, Alvarez A, Ordas B (2013) Molecular changes during intra and inter  
 382 recurrent selection of two populations of maize: one adapted and one non adapted  
 383 to the selection environment. *Euphytica* 193:359-367

384 Pinto LR, Vieira MCL, de Souza CL, de Souza AP (2003) Genetic diversity assessed by  
385 microsatellites in tropical maize populations submitted to a high-intensity  
386 reciprocal recurrent selection. *Euphytica* 134:277-286

387 Romay MC, Butron A, Ordas A, Revilla P, Ordas B (2012) Effect of recurrent selection on  
388 the genetic structure of two broad-based Spanish maize populations. *Crop Sci* 52:1493-  
389 1502

390 Weir BS (1996) *Genetic data analysis II*. Sinauer Associates, Sunderland, MA, USA

391

392

393

394

395 **Table 1** Percentage of polymorphic loci (Po), number of alleles per locus (A), observed  
396 heterozygosity (Ho) and fixation index (f) for the maize synthetics EPS20 and EPS21  
397 and the cycles selected from them by RRS-FS and RRS-FS-S<sub>2</sub>

Populations	Po	A	Ho	f
EPS20	0.96	3.06	0.44	0.06
EPS20(RRS-FS)C1	0.96	3.51	0.49	0.00
EPS20(RRS-FS)C2	0.91	2.92	0.39	0.04
EPS20(RRS-FS-S <sub>2</sub> )C1	0.92	3.00	0.43	0.05
EPS20(RRS-FS-S <sub>2</sub> )C2	0.92	2.75	0.43	-0.04
EPS21	1.00	3.81	0.56	0.04
EPS21(RRS-FS)C1	1.00	3.66	0.54	0.01
EPS21(RRS-FS)C2	1.00	3.68	0.55	0.00
EPS21(RRS-FS-S <sub>2</sub> )C1	1.00	3.58	0.50	0.08
EPS21(RRS-FS-S <sub>2</sub> )C2	0.98	3.38	0.44	0.00

398

399 **Table 2** Genetic distances between the maize synthetics EPS20 and EPS21 and the cycles selected from them by RRS-FS and RRS-FS-S<sub>2</sub>

Populations	EPS20	EPS20(RRS-FS)C1	EPS20(RRS-FS)C2	EPS20(RRS-FS-S <sub>2</sub> )C1	EPS20(RRS-FS-S <sub>2</sub> )C2	EPS21	EPS21(RRS-FS)C1	EPS21(RRS-FS)C2	EPS21(RRS-FS-S <sub>2</sub> )C1
EPS20(RRS-FS)C1	0.04								
EPS20(RRS-FS)C2	0.07	0.04							
EPS20(RRS-FS-S <sub>2</sub> )C1	0.04	0.04	0.06						
EPS20(RRS-FS-S <sub>2</sub> )C2	0.09	0.07	0.10	0.05					
EPS21	0.30	0.32	0.39	0.32	0.35				
EPS21(RRS-FS)C1	0.36	0.36	0.44	0.37	0.40	0.05			
EPS21(RRS-FS)C2	0.33	0.33	0.41	0.35	0.38	0.07	0.09		
EPS21(RRS-FS-S <sub>2</sub> )C1	0.30	0.32	0.38	0.32	0.37	0.04	0.08	0.06	
EPS21(RRS-FS-S <sub>2</sub> )C2	0.34	0.34	0.43	0.35	0.37	0.16	0.11	0.20	0.22

400

401

402 **Table 3** Genetic distances between the parental lines and the original and improved synthetics

	<b>CM109</b>	<b>CM139</b>	<b>CM15 1</b>	<b>A634</b>	<b>A639</b>	<b>A652</b>	<b>A664</b>	<b>W64A</b>
<b>EPS20</b>	0.22	0.22	0.48	0.29	0.41	0.45	0.35	0.44
EPS20(RRS-FS)C1	0.22	0.22	0.48	0.28	0.38	0.46	0.41	0.42
EPS20(RRS-FS)C2	0.24	0.24	0.46	0.31	0.35	0.52	0.44	0.47
EPS20(RRS-FS-S <sub>2</sub> )C1	0.27	0.27	0.49	0.28	0.40	0.42	0.33	0.46
EPS20(RRS-FS-S <sub>2</sub> )C2	0.36	0.36	0.47	0.31	0.45	0.46	0.44	0.47
	<b>EP17</b>	<b>EP43</b>	<b>EP53</b>	<b>PB60</b>	<b>PB130</b>	<b>F473</b>	<b>CO125</b>	<b>A509</b>
<b>EPS21</b>	0.51	0.46	0.50	0.33	0.50	0.50	0.45	0.44
EPS21(RRS-FS)C1	0.56	0.46	0.65	0.37	0.59	0.51	0.41	0.53
EPS21(RRS-FS)C2	0.70	0.55	0.52	0.41	0.50	0.41	0.51	0.47
EPS21(RRS-FS-S <sub>2</sub> )C1	0.67	0.49	0.48	0.43	0.50	0.50	0.43	0.46
EPS21(RRS-FS-S <sub>2</sub> )C2	0.61	0.56	0.74	0.36	0.75	0.70	0.58	0.59

403

404 **Table 4** For each marker, the number of populations in which the marker is not in HW  
 405 equilibrium and has positive and negative fixation indexes. Only those markers with  
 406 significant departure from HW equilibrium in more than two populations are shown.  
 407 For each marker the average fixation index over populations is also shown

Marker	Location (bin)	Significant HW (population number)	Positive fixation index (population number)	Negative fixation index (population number)	Average fixation index
Umc1222	1.02	5	7	3	0.10
Phi109275	1.03	3	5	5	0.05
Bnlg1347	1.10	5	9	1	0.31
Umc1165	2.01	5	8	2	0.16
Umc1185	2.03	4	5	5	0.02
Phi036	3.04	4	6	4	0.02
Umc1466	4.08	3	5	5	0.09
Umc1822	5.05	4	8	2	0.06
Phi128	5.07	4	8	2	0.19
Bnlg1154	6.05	3	8	2	0.16
Bnlg1740	6.07	5	6	4	0.11
Umc1653	6.07	3	5	0	0.19
Phi114	7.03	5	9	0	0.27
Umc1505	9.08	5	1	9	-0.28
Umc1453	10.04	6	9	1	0.32
Umc1930	10.04	5	4	6	-0.07

408 **Table 5** Percentage of pairs of markers in linkage disequilibrium within each chromosome

Chromosome	EPS20	EPS20(RR S-FS)C1	EPS20(RR S-FS)C2	EPS20(RR S-FS- S <sub>2</sub> )C1	EPS20(RR S-FS- S <sub>2</sub> )C2	EPS21	EPS21(RR S-FS)C1	EPS21(RR S-FS)C2	EPS21(RR- FS-S <sub>2</sub> )C1	EPS21(RR S-FS- S <sub>2</sub> )C2
1	0.50	0.46	0.50	0.46	0.57	0.11	0.11	0.21	0.07	0.11
2	0.18	0.50	0.11	0.43	0.29	0.54	0.39	0.57	0.54	0.43
4	0.58	0.14	0.06	0.06	0.36	0.00	0.19	0.19	0.03	0.14
5	0.50	0.80	0.20	0.50	0.10	0.30	0.10	0.30	0.3	0.00
6	0.48	0.48	0.29	0.29	0.43	0.38	0.57	0.52	0.71	0.81
7	0.00	0.33	0.67	0.33	0.00	0.33	0.33	0.33	0.67	0.00
8	0.83	0.33	0.00	0.17	0.17	1.00	0.17	0.00	0.17	0.33
9	0.00	0.40	0.20	0.90	0.10	0.10	0.00	0.00	0.20	0.00
10	0.33	0.67	0.00	0.67	0.67	0.33	0.00	0.67	0.67	1.00
Average within <sup>a</sup>	0.42	0.41	0.21	0.35	0.35	0.26	0.25	0.32	0.30	0.29
Average between <sup>b</sup>	0.39	0.36	0.19	0.34	0.31	0.23	0.20	0.28	0.30	0.25

409 <sup>a</sup> Average percentage of pairs of markers within the same chromosome in linkage disequilibrium

410 <sup>b</sup> Average percentage of pairs of markers from different chromosomes in linkage disequilibrium



411 **Table 6** Percentage of pairs of markers in linkage disequilibrium (LD) in the original synthetics and final cycles of selection for markers with  
412 high (>98 %) or low (<2 %) percentage of pairs in LD in the original synthetics. For those markers the allele frequencies are also shown

	EPS20	EPS20(RRS-FS)C2	EPS20(RRS-FS-S <sub>2</sub> )C2	EPS21	EPS21(RRS-FS)C2	EPS21(RRS-FS-S <sub>2</sub> )C2
phi056 (1.01)						
Marker pairs in LD (%)	23	6	35	2	21	12
A allele	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.12	0.27	0.00
B allele	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.16	0.21	0.00
C allele	0.65	0.17	0.09	0.46	0.40	0.07
D allele	0.25	0.56	0.88	0.24	0.10	0.93
E allele	0.08	0.27	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.00
umc1466 (4.08)						
Marker pairs in LD (%)	100	13	98	23	21	6
A allele	0.31	0.00	0.05	0.93	0.96	0.71
B allele	0.69	1.00	0.95	0.07	0.04	0.29
umc1963 (4.04)						
Marker pairs in LD (%)	40	12	17	2	27	23
A allele	0.87	0.98	1.00	0.91	0.71	1.00
B allele	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.08	0.00
C allele	0.11	0.02	0.00	0.04	0.017	0.00
D allele	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.04	0.00

413